



© 2017 National Strength and Conditioning Association. This is an author produced version of a paper published in Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self- archiving policy.

Jonathan, N., Russell, M., Shearer, D. et al (2017). Predictors of Linear and Multidirectional Acceleration in Elite Soccer Players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. DOI: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000001897

**Title:** Predictors of linear and multidirectional acceleration in elite soccer players

**Short title:** Linear and multidirectional acceleration predictors

**Authors:** Northeast, J.<sup>1</sup>, Russell, M.<sup>2</sup>, Shearer, D.<sup>3</sup>, Cook, C.<sup>4</sup>, Kilduff, L.<sup>5,6</sup>

**Affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup> Department of Sports Science, Swansea City AFC, Landore, Swansea, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup> School of Social and Health Sciences, Leeds Trinity University, Leeds, United Kingdom

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Life Sciences and Education, University of South Wales, Pontypridd, United Kingdom

<sup>4</sup> School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences, Bangor University, Bangor, UK

<sup>5</sup> Applied Sports Technology Exercise and Medicine Research Centre (A-STEM), Swansea University, Swansea, United Kingdom

<sup>6</sup> Welsh Institute of Performance Sciences (WIPS), Swansea University, Swansea, United Kingdom

## ABSTRACT

Linear and multidirectional acceleration underpins success in professional soccer match-play but the physical qualities that determine these performance indicators are poorly understood in elite players. English Premier League players ( $n=26$ ) performed isometric mid-thigh pulls (IMTP), bi-lateral and uni-lateral drop jumps (DJ; from 40 and 20 cm, respectively), bi-lateral and uni-lateral countermovement jumps (CMJ) and assessments of linear (5-, 10-, 20-m) and multidirectional (left/right pre-planned and reactive) acceleration. Regression analyses highlighted that 21% of variance in 5-m sprint time ( $1.02\pm0.07$  s) was explained by relative peak power output (PPO) in bi-lateral CMJ ( $54.5\pm5.3$  W·kg<sup>-1</sup>). A 5.4 W·kg<sup>-1</sup> increase in CMJ predicted a 0.03 s decrease in 5-m sprint time ( $P=0.02$ ). For 10-m sprint time ( $1.72\pm0.09$  s), 44% of variance was explained by isometric relative peak force (PF;  $30.4\pm4.9$  N·kg<sup>-1</sup>) and bi-lateral relative CMJ PPO ( $54.5\pm5.3$  W·kg<sup>-1</sup>). A 5.4 W·kg<sup>-1</sup> increase in CMJ predicted reduced 10-m sprint times by 0.04 s ( $P=0.01$ ). For 20-m sprint time ( $2.94\pm0.11$  s), 55% of the total variance was explained by isometric relative PF ( $30.4\pm4.9$  N·kg<sup>-1</sup>) and relative CMJ PPO ( $54.5\pm5.3$  W·kg<sup>-1</sup>). Increases of 5.4 W·kg<sup>-1</sup> in bi-lateral CMJ predicted an improvement of 20-m sprint time by 0.06 s ( $P=0.002$ ). Insignificant ( $P>0.05$ ) contributions were observed for pre-planned and reactive multidirectional acceleration. Indices derived from CMJ tests and IMTP, especially those related to force production relative to body mass, likely underpin linear, but not multidirectional, acceleration performance in professional soccer players. Such information is likely to inform the training and testing practices of this athletic population.

**Key words:** Speed, football, agility, velocity, prediction, sprinting

## INTRODUCTION

In soccer match-play, consistent reports highlight that low intensity activities such as walking and jogging dominate (1, 20) and that players cover 9–14 km per match (2, 21). Conversely, high intensity actions are performed every 70 s (24) and represent between 8-12% of the total match distance covered. However, despite the sport being primarily aerobic in nature (1), it is likely that high intensity actions contribute directly to success in soccer. For example, 83% of goals scored in the first German national league (8) were preceded by at least one powerful action from either the scoring or assisting player. Enhanced knowledge of key physical determinants of elite soccer performance will likely inform the optimization of training programme design and the performance assessments included in testing batteries.

Previous investigations have highlighted that indices of high intensity running discriminated between soccer players of differing performance levels (15). For example, Reilly et al. (18) highlighted that linear sprinting speed and the ability to change direction while sprinting were powerful differentiators between elite and sub-elite players. With this in mind, identification of the key qualities that influence linear and multidirectional speed could help to ensure that training practices are personalized and focused upon improving the key qualities that influence performance in a time-efficient manner.

Indices of strength, power and reactive strength have previously been highlighted as predictors of both linear (3, 29) and multidirectional (30) sprint performance. Indeed, reactive strength, the ability of the neuromuscular system to tolerate a relatively high stretch load and change from rapid eccentric to rapid concentric movements, has

been found to demonstrate the strongest relationship to change of direction speed in amateur male athletes (30). However, not all studies have demonstrated such associations; notably, Marcovic (14) observed weak relationships between indices of leg extensor strength and power, and performance on a number of pre-planned change of direction tests in physical education students. For linear sprinting, Requena et al. (19) reported no relationship between variables derived from isometric mid-thigh pull (IMTP) tests and 15 m sprint time in semi-professional soccer players. Such equivocal findings highlight that further research is warranted to isolate key physical characteristics that underpin linear and multidirectional speed performances; especially, in elite athletes who have largely been omitted from such research previously (3, 14, 19, 29, 30). The aim of this study was therefore to examine which variables derived from commonly used assessments such as IMTP, countermovement jumps (CMJ) and drop jumps (DJ) predicted linear and multidirectional speed performances in elite soccer players.

## **METHODS**

### *Experimental approach to the problem*

This cross-sectional and observational study investigated relationships between variables collected throughout a typical pre-season testing battery that included IMTP, DJ, CMJ, linear acceleration and multidirectional agility (pre-planned and reactive) tests. The study presents data from players competing in the 2015/2016 season. The activity in the 48 h period before habituation and main trial testing included a single training session that lasted no longer than 60 min and started at ~10:30 h. These sessions typically required a channel warm-up (including dynamic stretches and short sprints), box drills (e.g., static keep ball, 6 vs 2) and tactical practices to be performed and were characterized as low volume and low intensity. Players were advised to rest in the afternoons following training. Test–retest reliabilities (intraclass correlation coefficient) for peak force (PF), peak rate of force development (PRFD), and maximum jump height were 0.98, 0.89, and 0.98, respectively.

### *Subjects*

Data is presented for 26 professional soccer players (age:  $25 \pm 4$  years, mass:  $76.3 \pm 8.6$  kg, stature:  $179 \pm 8$  cm) who played in outfield positions for a senior team of an English Premier League soccer club. The study required players to provide informed consent prior to participation and conformed to the Code of Ethics of the World Medical Association (approved by the ethics advisory board of Swansea University). All players were considered healthy and injury-free at the time of the study and were

in the pre-season phase of their full time training cycle. Participants were recruited on the basis that they had been engaged in a full time professional soccer training program for at least 2 years and were able to complete each of the performance assessments with correct technique.

### *Procedures*

Following habituation of main trial procedures, players presented to the laboratory after having followed a standardized dietary intake as directed by the club's performance nutritionist. Upon arrival, and following voiding of bladder and bowels, players performed a ~20 min warm-up on an indoor synthetic running track that included dynamic stretches and short sprints before a practice attempt at each of the performance tests. A 5 min passive rest period preceded the performance of 3 attempts at each of the testing battery assessments in the order of CMJ (bi-lateral then uni-lateral), DJ (bi-lateral then uni-lateral), IMTP, linear acceleration (20 m from standing start with 5 and 10 m split) and multidirectional acceleration (pre-planned then reactive). Each attempt was separated by a 5 min recovery period.

### **Isometric Mid-Thigh Pull (IMTP)**

The IMTP testing was carried out with players standing on a portable force platform (type 92866AA, Kistler Instruments Ltd., Farnborough, United Kingdom), which was centrally positioned on the floor underneath the bar of a power rack. Players assumed a body position similar to that when completing the second pull of a power clean with a flat trunk position and their shoulders in line with the bar; thus

maintaining a knee angle of approximately  $120\text{--}130^{\circ}$  (checked using a goniometer, Smith & Nephew, Hull, United Kingdom) as per previous research (9, 25, 27). The bar height could be fixed at various heights above the force platform, to accommodate players of different sizes, and the rack was anchored to the floor. Once bar height was established, players stood on the force platform and their hands were strapped to the bar (9, 25, 27). The vertical component of the ground reaction force (GRF) during a maximal effort of the IMTP was measured using the portable force platform with built-in charge amplifier.

A sample rate of 1000 Hz and a vertical force range of 20 kN were used for all trials. The force–time data were recorded on a portable computer using a 16-bit analogue-to-digital converter. A sample length of 10 s was used for all trials, consisting of a pre-trigger phase (a record of the force–time history immediately before the trigger switch was operated) of two seconds, and a post-trigger phase (a record of the force–time history immediately after the trigger switch had been operated; including the IMTP) of eight seconds. The trigger switch simultaneously illuminated a signal lamp to inform the player to commence the pull and players were instructed to pull as hard and as fast as possible for a period of approximately five seconds. These commands were based on previous research indicating that the use of these instructions produces optimal results for PF and PRFD (5).

Analysis of the IMTP data was as per previous methods incorporating elite team sport athletes (27) and required identification of a reliable start time ( $T_s$ ) using instantaneous rate of change of force with respect to time data calculated from the first derivative of the vertical component of the GRF-time history. After identification



of Ts (the instant after the trigger point that the first derivative exceeded the mean value plus five standard deviations; SD), PF was determined as the peak value from the vertical component of the GRF–time history minus the player’s body weight. The F100 variable was defined as the absolute value of the vertical component of the GRF minus the subject’s body weight at 100 ms after Ts. The PRFD was taken as the maximum value of the first derivative of the vertical component of the GRF–time history following Ts.

#### Countermovement jump testing

Using a portable force platform and CMJ analyses, peak power output (PPO) was determined according to methods described previously (17, 27). The vertical component of the GRF during the CMJ and the player’s body mass was used to determine instantaneous velocity and displacement of the player’s centre of gravity. Instantaneous power output was determined using Equation 1 and the highest value produced was deemed PPO. Values represent peak data derived from three attempts and bi-lateral and uni-lateral CMJ attempts were performed separately.

Eq’n 1:  $\text{Power (W)} = \text{vertical GRF (N)} \times \text{Vertical velocity of centre of gravity (m} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}\text{)}$

#### Drop jump (DJ) testing

Reactive strength index (RSI) was measured via the use of DJ from a plyometric box (20 and 40 cm for uni-lateral and bi-lateral attempts, respectively) onto a portable force platform. In order to minimize the influence of arm swing, hands were isolated at the hips. When instructed, players stepped off the box, landed and then jumped as high as possible before landing back on the force platform. Players were instructed

to minimize ground contact time while seeking to maximize jump height. Equation 2 presents how RSI was calculated and DJ stiffness was calculated as peak vertical force (ignoring any initial impact peak) divided by the vertical displacement of the center of mass (22). Displacement of the center of mass between touchdown and the lowest point was determined from double integration of the vertical acceleration data (6) with vertical velocity assumed to be zero halfway through the flight phase following ground contact. Bi-lateral and uni-lateral DJ were performed separately. Values represent peak data derived from three attempts.

Eq'n 2: Reactive strength index (RSI) = Flight time (FT) / Contact time (CT)

Where FT is the time interval between toe-off and landing and CT represents time difference between first contact and toe-off

#### Linear acceleration testing

The time taken to cover a distance of 20 m from a stationary start was used as the measure of linear acceleration. Players started in a 2-point crouched position with their preferred foot forward on a mark 0.3 m before the start gate, and sprinted maximally through timing gates (Brower Timing System, Salt Lake City, UT, USA) set up at 0 m (start), 5 m, 10 m and 20 m (finish). Players were instructed to run as fast as possible from start to finish by running to a cone placed 2 m beyond the final gate. The fastest time of 3 trials was used for data analysis.

#### Multidirectional acceleration testing

Reactive and pre-planned multidirectional acceleration were both assessed via the Y-shaped agility test (16). The test has been found to be reliable (16) and to demonstrate construct validity for reactive agility in team sport players (12). Briefly, the test incorporated four pairs of timing gates (Fusion Sports, Coopers Plains,

Australia) and was set up as per Lockie et al. (12). Players were required to accelerate from a standing start and to run straight ahead (7.5 m) before cutting left or right in either a pre-planned (as per pre-test instructions) or reactive (in response to a light stimulus) manner and sprinting towards a finish line (7.5 m from the middle gate) that was positioned at a 45° angle from the middle pair of timing gates.

Players began each attempt 0.3 m behind the start line and were encouraged to perform the test maximally at all times. For assessment of pre-planned multidirectional acceleration, players were informed a-priori about which direction to turn, and were encouraged to initiate the change of direction once passing through the middle timing gate. Three trials, each cutting left and right, were completed for the pre-planned multidirectional acceleration condition. The fastest trial for each direction change was analyzed.

For reactive multi-directional acceleration, players commenced the initial stages of the test as per the pre-planned condition but were required to visually scan for a flashing light stimulus that was triggered by passing through the middle timing gate. Once identified, players cut either left or right by 45° and sprinted through the final flashing timing gate. As per the pre-planned condition, players performed six attempts but the timing-lights software was programmed such that an equal number of left and right attempts were completed in a randomized order that was unbeknown to players. The fastest trial for each turn was retained for analysis.

### *Statistical Analysis*

All data is presented as mean  $\pm$  SD and an alpha level of  $P \leq 0.05$  denoted significance. Akin to the research question, seven variables were identified as dependent variables (as per the top row of Table 2). Based on previous research, 22 predictors were initially considered as possible indicators of these dependent variables; with the intention being to reduce this number by exploring the data for significant correlations. All variables were examined for normality using visual examination of histograms and Shapiro-Wilks test, whereby significance indicated non-normality. Seven variables displayed non-normal distributions and this data was bootstrapped to counter the effects of non-normality for use of parametric statistics (7). Therefore, for the first stage of the data analysis a two-tailed Pearson's correlation was used, with 1000 bootstrap samples. All predictors that indicated a moderate (i.e.,  $R=0.3$  upwards) and significant correlation were kept for further analysis, while all other variables were removed. Linear or multiple regressions were then used as appropriate with the remaining predictor variables and their dependent variable correlates. Significance and relative contribution of predictors was determined using a combination of standardized Beta values, t-statistics (i.e., the predictor makes a significant contribution to the model) and 95% confidence intervals (i.e., non-overlap with zero). Statements were made regarding the magnitude of change in the dependent variables resulting from a 1 SD change (increase or decrease) in the predictor variable.

## RESULTS

Table 1 characterizes performance for all tests undertaken. Moderate and significant correlations with at least 1 of the 7 dependent variables (Table 2) were highlighted for 5 predictor variables (Table 3) which were retained for further scrutiny while the remaining variables were disregarded.

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT TABLE 1 NEAR HERE \*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT TABLE 2 NEAR HERE \*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT TABLE 3 NEAR HERE \*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT TABLE 4 NEAR HERE \*\*\*\*\*

### *Predictors of linear acceleration*

For 5 m sprint time, relative PPO during bi-lateral CMJ explained 21% of the variance ( $R^2=0.21$ ) and significant standardized beta values ( $P=0.020$ ;  $CI=-0.002, -0.010$ ) indicated that for every 1 SD increase in relative CMJ PPO ( $5.37 \text{ W}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$ ), a resultant decrease of 0.03 s in 5 m sprint time was predicted.

For 10 m sprint time, isometric relative PF and relative CMJ PPO contributed a total of 44% of the variance ( $R^2=0.44$ ). Standardized beta values highlighted that isometric relative PF made a near significant contribution to the model ( $P=0.080$ ;  $CI = -0.12, 0.04$ ) such that an increase of  $5.1 \text{ N}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$  (i.e., 1 SD) would result in a 0.03 s reduction in 10 m time. However as bootstrap confidence intervals overlapped zero, the result should be treated as potentially unreliable. Relative CMJ PPO made a significant contribution to the model ( $P=0.010$ ;  $CI=-0.003, -0.013$ ) whereby an increase of  $5.4 \text{ W}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$  would result in a reduction of 10 m sprint time by 0.04 s.

For 20 m sprint time, the regression model indicated that isometric relative PF and relative CMJ PPO contributed a total of 55% of the variance ( $R^2=0.55$ ). Standardized beta values indicated that isometric relative PF made a significant contribution to the model ( $P=0.050$ ; CI=-0.12, 0.04) with a  $5.1 \text{ N}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$  increase in force resulting in a 0.04 s decrease in 20 m sprint time. However, as before, bootstrap confidence intervals indicated that beta values for isometric relative PF encompassed zero and should therefore be interpreted cautiously. Relative CMJ PPO made a significant contribution ( $P=0.002$ ; CI=-0.008, -0.018) to the model whereby an increase of  $5.4 \text{ W}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$  would result in a 0.06 s decrease in 20 m sprint time. Bootstrap confidence intervals for relative CMJ PPO bootstrap did not encompass zero and can therefore be considered more robust.

#### *Predictors of multidirectional acceleration*

For the reactive left condition, despite the moderate correlation observed, both contact time and RSI for the uni-lateral left leg DJ only explained 23% of variance ( $R^2=0.23$ ). Standardized beta values indicated that for both of these variables this contribution was non-significant ( $P>0.05$ ) with confidence intervals overlapping zero considerably (contact time CI = -2.10, 2.51; RSI CI = -0.65, 0.16). No further variables contributed ( $P>0.05$ ) to the models for either pre-planned or reactive multidirectional acceleration.

## DISCUSSION

The primary aim of this study was to isolate specific variables derived from IMTP, CMJ and DJ assessments and identify meaningful changes for the prediction of linear and multidirectional acceleration performances in elite soccer players. Our findings indicated that relative PPO from bi-lateral CMJ contributed significantly to linear sprint acceleration performances over distances of up to 20 m. Although relativized PF (derived from IMTP) significantly predicted 20 m linear sprint times, a cautious interpretation of this variable should be noted due to a potential lack of reliability. Conversely, no indices examined throughout the IMTP, CMJ or DJ predicted multidirectional speed performance. Such information will likely assist strength and conditioning professionals in tailoring the design of testing batteries and training programs that involve elite soccer players.

Relative PPO during the bi-lateral CMJ contributed significantly to linear sprinting performances over 5 m, 10 m and 20 m in English Premier League soccer players. Despite the array of variables examined in this study, relative CMJ PPO was the only marker to predict performance across all distances of linear sprinting assessed. It is plausible that the contribution of bi-lateral relative PPO reflects established relationships between markers of strength and explosive performance (28). Previous definitions of strength from IMTP testing (strong:  $\geq 38.72 \pm 2.08 \text{ 01 N}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$ ; weak:  $\leq 30.40 \pm 4.01 \text{ N}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$ ; (26)) would characterize the players in this study as being weak according to their relative PF values (Table 1). However, inconsistencies exist between studies concerning the inclusion of body mass in such analyses. Nevertheless, as the relationships presented here should hold true across the entire measurement range, a rationale exists for including indices of CMJ performance in testing batteries used with elite soccer players. Practitioners should also focus on the

development of such variables as training priorities; particularly with respect to the meaningful change data reported here.

Isometric PF expressed relative to body mass, contributed significantly to 20 m linear sprint performances; although caution should be exercised due to the spanning of zero of CI data. Such findings support those observed previously using a bi-variate correlational approach in elite Rugby League athletes (27). Regression analyses highlighted that increases in relative PF of  $5.1 \text{ N}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$  would predict improved sprint times by 0.03 s and 0.04 s over 10 m (1.7%) and 20 m (1.4%), respectively. To contextualize, increases in IMTP PF of approx.  $3.3 \text{ N}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$  (from  $31.6 \pm 4.7 \text{ N}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$  to  $34.9 \pm 6.0 \text{ N}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$ ) have been realised after a 20 week intervention that focused on maximal strength development in a group of cyclists exhibiting comparable strength levels to the players recruited to this study (4). As match distances covered above  $18 \text{ km}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$  (15) and performance on isolated linear sprint tests (18) differentiate between elite and sub-elite players, our findings provide context about potentially meaningful changes that should be targeted in soccer players.

In agreement with West et al. (27), absolute PF did not contribute to models of linear or multidirectional sprint times. Relative strength expressed per unit of body mass, rather than absolute force output, has been proposed to influence whole-body displacement (11); albeit in the vertical direction. As linear sprint performance is dependent upon body mass acceleration rather than overcoming inertia and/or air resistance experienced during sprint cycling (25) or rapid acceleration of an Olympic bar (9), the ability to produce high levels of force relative to body mass has been proposed as being superior to absolute measures of PF (27). Indeed, where absolute isometric PF and dynamic performance indices have been found to be related, a bias towards activities that limit stretch-shortening cycle (e.g., cycling (5);



snatch (9)) actions are noted. Nevertheless, this study supports previous findings (27) and highlights the utility of isometric strength testing for characterizing dynamic performance in elite team sports players despite previous criticism (10).

Strength, power and reactive strength have been outlined as physical factors which may underpin multidirectional speed (30) but this relationship might only be observed when comparing tasks that involve limited numbers of directional changes over short distances (23). Notably, none of the 22 variables examined here predicted performance in either the pre-planned or reactive multi-directional speed tasks in a population of elite soccer players. Acknowledging the potential impact of the homogeneity of participants when interpreting studies examining predictors of change of direction speed (13), it is plausible that cognitive as opposed to physical characteristics, better predict multidirectional speed tasks that incorporate a reactive component. Indeed, similarities between elite and non-elite athletes in pre-planned agility tasks diminish when a reactive stimulus is introduced (12). To this end, it is not surprising that physical indices were unable to predict reactive agility performance in elite soccer players. Further research opportunities therefore exist to better define the aspects of cognition that underpin reactive agility performance and thus should be prioritised when training team sports athletes.

## **PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS**

Relative CMJ PPO predicted linear sprint performances of elite soccer players over 5, 10 and 20 m distances; the only variable to demonstrate a consistent prediction of performance to each of these key performance indicators. Additionally, relative PF (derived from an IMTP) predicted 10 and 20 m linear sprint times, but the potential application of this variable should be used with caution due to potential reliability issues. Notably, no indices of IMTP, CMJ or DJ performance predicted multidirectional sprint times on reactive or pre-planned agility tests. These findings highlight that CMJ and IMTP assessments (and their indices) should be considered for inclusion in the testing batteries of elite soccer players when seeking to appraise the efficacy of interventions seeking to improve linear sprint performance. Attempting to improve performance on such tests, especially those aspects related to force production relativized to body mass, will likely confer performance benefits to soccer players in linear, but not multidirectional, speed tests. Further insight in to the prediction of reactive multidirectional speed tasks is required.

## REFERENCES

1. Bangsbo, J. Energy demands in competitive soccer. *J Sports Sci* 12: S5-S12, 1994.
2. Bangsbo, J, Mohr, M, and Krstrup, P. Physical and metabolic demands of training and match-play in the elite football player. *J Sports Sci* 24: 665-674, 2006.
3. Barr, MJ and Nolte, VW. Which measure of drop jump performance best predicts sprinting speed? *J Strength Cond Res* 25: 1976-1982, 2011.
4. Beattie, K, Carson, BP, Lyons, M, and Kenny, IC. The effect of maximal- & explosive-strength training on performance indicators in cyclists. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*: 1-25, 2016.
5. Bemben, MG, Clasey, JL, and Massey, BH. The effect of the rate of muscle contraction on the force-time curve parameters of male and female subjects. *Res Q Exerc Sport* 61: 96-99, 1990.
6. Cavagna, GA. Force platforms as ergometers. *J Appl Physiol* 39: 174-179, 1975.
7. Desharnais, B, Camirand-Lemyre, F, Mireault, P, and Skinner, CD. Determination of confidence intervals in non-normal data: application of the bootstrap to cocaine concentration in femoral blood. *J Anal Toxicol* 39: 113-117, 2015.
8. Faude, O, Koch, T, and Meyer, T. Straight sprinting is the most frequent action in goal situations in professional football. *J Sports Sci* 30: 625-631, 2012.
9. Haff, GG, Carlock, JM, Hartman, MJ, Kilgore, JL, Kawamori, N, Jackson, JR, Morris, RT, Sands, WA, and Stone, MH. Force-time curve characteristics of dynamic and isometric muscle actions of elite women olympic weightlifters. *J Strength Cond Res* 19: 741-748, 2005.
10. Kawamori, N, Rossi, SJ, Justice, BD, Haff, EE, Pistilli, EE, O'Bryant, HS, Stone, MH, and Haff, GG. Peak force and rate of force development during isometric and dynamic mid-thigh clean pulls performed at various intensities. *J Strength Cond Res* 20: 483-491, 2006.
11. Khamoui, AV, Brown, LE, Nguyen, D, Uribe, BP, Coburn, JW, Noffal, GJ, and Tran, T. Relationship between force-time and velocity-time characteristics of dynamic and isometric muscle actions. *J Strength Cond Res* 25: 198-204, 2011.
12. Lockie, RG, Jeffriess, MD, McGann, TS, Callaghan, SJ, and Schultz, AB. Planned and reactive agility performance in semiprofessional and amateur basketball players. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 9: 766-771, 2014.
13. Maloney, SJ, Richards, J, Nixon, DG, Harvey, LJ, and Fletcher, IM. Do stiffness and asymmetries predict change of direction performance? *J Sports Sci*: 1-10, 2016.
14. Marcovic, G. Poor relationship between strength and power qualities and agility performance. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness* 47: 276-283, 2007.
15. Mohr, M, Krstrup, P, and Bangsbo, J. Match performance of high-standard soccer players with special reference to development of fatigue. *J Sports Sci* 21: 519-528, 2003.
16. Oliver, JL and Meyers, RW. Reliability and generality of measures of acceleration, planned agility, and reactive agility. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 4: 345-354, 2009.

17. Owen, NJ, Watkins, J, Kilduff, LP, Bevan, HR, and Bennett, MA. Development of a criterion method to determine peak mechanical power output in a countermovement jump. *J Strength Cond Res* 28: 1552-1558, 2014.
18. Reilly, T, Williams, AM, Nevill, A, and Franks, A. A multidisciplinary approach to talent identification in soccer. *J Sports Sci* 18: 695-702, 2000.
19. Requena, B, Gonzalez-Badillo, JJ, de Villareal, ES, Ereline, J, Garcia, I, Gapeyeva, H, and Paasuke, M. Functional performance, maximal strength, and power characteristics in isometric and dynamic actions of lower extremities in soccer players. *J Strength Cond Res* 23: 1391-1401, 2009.
20. Russell, M, Rees, G, Benton, D, and Kingsley, M. An exercise protocol that replicates soccer match-play. *Int J Sports Med* 32: 511-518, 2011.
21. Russell, M, Sparkes, W, Northeast, J, Cook, CJ, Love, TD, Bracken, RM, and Kilduff, LP. Changes in acceleration and deceleration capacity throughout professional soccer match-play. *J Strength Cond Res* 30: 2839-2844, 2016.
22. Serpell, BG, Ball, NB, Scarvell, JM, and Smith, PN. A review of models of vertical, leg, and knee stiffness in adults for running, jumping or hopping tasks. *J Sports Sci* 30: 1347-1363, 2012.
23. Sheppard, JM and Young, WB. Agility literature review: classifications, training and testing. *J Sports Sci* 24: 919-932, 2006.
24. Stolen, T, Chamari, K, Castagna, C, and Wisloff, U. Physiology of soccer: an update. *Sports Med* 35: 501-536, 2005.
25. Stone, MH, Sands, WA, Carlock, J, Callan, S, Dickie, D, Daigle, K, Cotton, J, Smith, SL, and Hartman, M. The importance of isometric maximum strength and peak rate-of-force development in sprint cycling. *J Strength Cond Res* 18: 878-884, 2004.
26. Thomas, C, Jones, PA, Rothwell, J, Chiang, CY, and Comfort, P. An investigation into the relationship between maximum isometric strength and vertical jump performance. *J Strength Cond Res* 29: 2176-2185, 2015.
27. West, DJ, Owen, NJ, Jones, MR, Bracken, RM, Cook, CJ, Cunningham, DJ, Shearer, DA, Finn, CV, Newton, RU, Crewther, BT, and Kilduff, LP. Relationships between force-time characteristics of the isometric midhigh pull and dynamic performance in professional rugby league players. *J Strength Cond Res* 25: 3070-3075, 2011.
28. Wisloff, U, Castagna, C, Helgerud, J, Jones, R, and Hoff, J. Strong correlation of maximal squat strength with sprint performance and vertical jump height in elite soccer players. *Br J Sports Med* 38: 285-288, 2004.
29. Young, W, McLean, B, and Ardagna, J. Relationship between strength qualities and sprinting performance. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness* 35: 13-19, 1995.
30. Young, WB, James, R, and Montgomery, I. Is muscle power related to running speed with changes of direction? *J Sports Med Phys Fitness* 42: 282-288, 2002.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

None to declare. The results of the present study do not constitute endorsement by the authors or the NSCA.

## FIGURE LEGENDS

Table 1: Performance indices from IMTP, CMJ, DJ, linear and multidirectional sprinting (mean  $\pm$  SD)

Table 2. Correlations (R values) of all predictor variables to measures of linear (5 m, 10 m, 20 m) and multidirectional (pre-planned and reactive) sprinting

Table 3: Correlations (R values) of those variables carried forward into regression analysis

Table 4: Unstandardized and standardized Beta values for each of the 5 regression models

Table 1: Performance indices from IMTP, CMJ, DJ, linear and multidirectional sprinting (mean  $\pm$  SD)

Assessment	Variable	Performance
Isometric mid-thigh pull (IMTP)	PF (N)	2361.9 $\pm$ 336.7
	Relative PF (N $\cdot$ kg <sup>-1</sup> )	30.41 $\pm$ 4.91
	Peak RFD (N $\cdot$ s <sup>-1</sup> )	15578.7 $\pm$ 7559.6
	F100 (N)	755.1 $\pm$ 332.4
	Relative F100 (N $\cdot$ kg <sup>-1</sup> )	9.8 $\pm$ 4.3
Countermovement jump (CMJ)	Bilateral jump height (m)	0.39 $\pm$ 0.04
	Bilateral PPO (W)	4229.1 $\pm$ 602.9
	Bilateral relative PPO (W $\cdot$ kg <sup>-1</sup> )	54.5 $\pm$ 5.3
	Unilateral left leg jump height (m)	0.21 $\pm$ 0.03
	Unilateral right leg jump height (m)	0.22 $\pm$ 0.03
Drop jump (DJ)	Unilateral asymmetry (m)	0.01 $\pm$ 0.03
	Bilateral contact time (ms)	204.2 $\pm$ 4.3
	Bilateral jump height (m)	0.30 $\pm$ 0.05
	Bilateral stiffness	27.4 $\pm$ 12.4
	Bilateral RSI	2.50 $\pm$ 0.47
	Unilateral left leg contact time (ms)	275.8 $\pm$ 4.3
	Unilateral left leg jump height (m)	0.17 $\pm$ 0.04
	Unilateral left leg RSI	1.35 $\pm$ 0.23
	Unilateral right leg contact time (ms)	272.3 $\pm$ 4.5
	Unilateral right leg jump height (m)	0.17 $\pm$ 0.04
	Unilateral right leg RSI	1.38 $\pm$ 0.25
	Unilateral asymmetry (m)	0.00 $\pm$ 0.02
Linear sprinting	5 m (s)	1.02 $\pm$ 0.07
	10 m (s)	1.72 $\pm$ 0.09
	20 m (s)	2.94 $\pm$ 0.11
Multidirectional sprinting	Pre-planned; left (s)	2.94 $\pm$ 0.24
	Pre-planned; right (s)	2.92 $\pm$ 0.10
	Reactive; left (s)	3.61 $\pm$ 0.14
	Reactive; right (s)	3.63 $\pm$ 0.15

IMTP: Isometric mid-thigh pull, CMJ: Countermovement jump, DJ: Drop jump, PF: Peak force, PPO: Peak power, RFD: Rate of force development, F100: Force at 100 ms, RSI: Reactive strength index

Table 2. Correlations (R-values) of all predictor variables to measures of linear (5 m, 10 m, 20 m) and multidirectional (pre-planned and reactive) sprinting

Assessment	Variable	Key performance indicator						
		Linear sprinting (s)			Multidirectional sprinting (s)			
		5 m	10 m	20 m	Pre-planned		Reactive	
					Left	Right	Left	Right
Isometric mid-thigh pull (IMTP)	PF	-0.084	-0.289	-0.249	-0.024	-0.070	0.160	-0.296
	Relative PF	-0.360	-0.477*	-0.478*	-0.059	-0.371	0.008	-0.419
	Peak RFD	-0.022	-0.139	-0.094	-0.092	-0.167	0.141	-0.125
	F100	-0.113	-0.311	-0.206	-0.214	-0.129	0.094	-0.332
	Relative F100	-0.219	-0.391	-0.303	-0.225	-0.233	0.052	-0.377
Countermovement jump (CMJ)	Bilateral jump height	-0.403	-0.508*	-0.614**	-0.117	-0.348	-0.108	-0.023
	Bilateral PPO	0.013	-0.139	-0.185	0.136	0.108	-0.050	0.060
	Bilateral relative PPO	-0.472*	-0.540*	-0.643**	0.094	-0.388	-0.307	-0.133
	Unilateral left leg CMJ jump height	-0.283	-0.354	-0.406	0.002	-0.180	0.078	-0.026
	Unilateral right leg CMJ jump height	-0.182	-0.190	-0.337	0.109	-0.107	-0.029	0.074
	Unilateral CMJ asymmetry score	-0.016	0.030	-0.124	0.144	0.003	-0.102	0.121
Drop jump (DJ)	Bilateral contact time	0.184	0.154	0.137	0.260	0.245	0.002	0.249
	Bilateral jump height	0.071	-0.044	-0.070	0.198	0.114	-0.021	0.067
	Bilateral stiffness	0.054	0.005	0.012	-0.079	-0.034	-0.006	-0.164
	Bilateral RSI	-0.121	-0.165	-0.167	-0.145	-0.150	-0.031	-0.239
	Unilateral left leg contact time	0.230	0.203	0.183	0.364	0.335	0.060	0.433*
	Unilateral left leg jump height	-0.165	-0.304	-0.220	0.07	-0.034	0.042	-0.081
	Unilateral left leg RSI	-0.227	-0.32	-0.256	-0.243	-0.274	0.014	-0.450*
	Unilateral right leg contact time	0.214	0.231	0.233	0.288	0.299	-0.015	0.244
	Unilateral right leg jump height	-0.175	-0.290	-0.233	0.036	-0.154	0.091	-0.051
	Unilateral right leg RSI	-0.239	-0.336	-0.309	-0.201	-0.355	0.071	-0.292
	Unilateral asymmetry score	-0.008	0.056	-0.010	-0.080	-0.252	0.101	0.069

\*\* Correlation is significant at the  $P < 0.01$  level (2-tailed). \* Correlation is significant at the  $P < 0.05$  level (2-tailed). IMTP: Isometric mid-thigh pull, CMJ: Countermovement jump, DJ: Drop jump, PF: Peak force, PPO: Peak power output, F100: Force at 100 ms, RSI: Reactive strength index



Table 3: Correlations (R values) of those variables carried forward into regression analysis

Assessment	Variable	Linear sprinting			Multidirectional sprinting
		5 m	10 m	20 m	Reactive right
Isometric mid-thigh pull (IMTP)	Relative PF	-0.360	-0.477*	-0.478*	-0.419
Countermovement jump (CMJ)	Bilateral jump height	-0.403	-0.508*	-0.614**	-0.023
	Bilateral relative PPO	-0.472*	-0.540*	-0.643**	-0.133
Drop jump (DJ)	Unilateral left leg contact time	0.230	0.203	0.183	0.433*
	Unilateral left leg RSI	-0.227	-0.320	-0.256	-0.450*

\*\* Correlation is significant at the  $P < 0.01$  level (2-tailed). \* Correlation is significant at the  $P < 0.05$  level (2-tailed). IMTP: Isometric mid-thigh pull, CMJ: Countermovement jump, DJ: Drop jump, PF: Peak force, PPO: Peak power output, RSI: Reactive strength index

Table 4: Unstandardized and standardized Beta values for each of the 5 regression models

Assessment	Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>β</i>
5 m sprint time	Constant	1.096	0.181	
	Relative CMJ PPO	-0.006	0.003	-0.460*
10 m sprint time	Constant	2.339	0.166	
	IMTP Relative PF	-0.066	0.028	-0.406*
	Relative CMJ PPO	-0.008	0.003	-0.476*
20 m sprint time	Constant	3.836	0.188	
	IMTP Relative PF	-0.076	0.032	-0.368*
	Relative CMJ PPO	-0.012	0.003	-0.599**
Reactive (left)	Constant	3.665	0.51	
	Uni-lateral left leg DJ contact time	0.825	1.039	0.231
	Uni-lateral left leg DJ RSI	-0.19	0.193	-0.287

\*\* Standardized beta values are significant at the  $P < 0.01$  level. \* Standardized beta values are significant at the  $P < 0.05$  level. IMTP: Isometric mid-thigh pull, CMJ: Countermovement jump, DJ: Drop jump, PF: Peak force, PPO: Peak power output, RSI: Reactive strength index

